

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STEVEN LIPOVSKY, SR., )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Civil Action No. 06-1471  
DAVID HOGUE, et al, ) Judge Gary L. Lancaster  
Defendant. ) Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

**I. RECOMMENDATION**

It is respectfully recommended that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed in accordance with the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

**II. REPORT**

On September 15, 2006, Plaintiff, Steven Lipovsky, Sr., was arrested on charges of Rape of Unconscious Victim, Aggravated Assault Without Consent; and Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse (IDSI) of Person Substantially Impaired; he has been detained at the Armstrong County Jail (ACJ) since his arrest. (Public Docket Sheet in Case No. CP-03-CR-0000889-2006 in the Court of Common Pleas of Armstrong County). He is proceeding *pro se* in his criminal action and complains about alleged inadequacies in the law library at the ACJ. For the reasons that follow, the Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

### **A. Standard of Review**

This Court must review Plaintiff's Complaint in accordance with the amendments promulgated in the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). Pertinent to the case at bar is the authority granted to federal courts for *sua sponte* screening and dismissal of prisoner claims. Specifically, Congress enacted a new statutory provision at 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, entitled "Screening," which requires the court to review complaints filed by prisoners seeking redress from a governmental entity or an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). If the complaint is "frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted," or "seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief," the court must dismiss the complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

In addition, Congress significantly amended Title 28 of the United States Code, section 1915, which establishes the criteria for allowing an action to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), *i.e.*, without prepayment of costs. Section 1915(e) (as amended) requires the federal courts to review complaints filed by persons who are proceeding *in forma pauperis* and to dismiss, at any time, any action that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Plaintiff is considered a "prisoner" as that term is defined under the PLRA.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Sections 1915 and 1915A, as amended, define the term "prisoner" as "any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole,

Defendants are officers or employees of a governmental entity, *i.e.*, SCIP and DOC. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action. Thus his allegations must be reviewed in accordance with the directives provided in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A & 1915(e). In reviewing complaints under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A & 1915(e), a federal court applies the same standard applied to motions to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).<sup>2</sup> Dismissal is proper under Rule 12(b)(6) if, as a matter of law, it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations. Hishon v. King & Spalding, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984); Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41 (1957). Notwithstanding, a plaintiff must allege specific facts supporting his claims to withstand dismissal for failure to state a claim. Brock v. St. Joseph's Hosp., 104 F.3d 358 (4th Cir. Dec. 23, 1996); Whitehead v. Becton, 1996 WL 761937 (D.C. Cir. 1996).

### **B. Plaintiff's Claim and Liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

Plaintiff seeks recovery under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged inadequacies of the law library at ACJ in that the law library does not contain the “new” statutory provisions concerning DNA detection of sexual offenders by the Pennsylvania State Police. Specifically, he claims that the library contains only 42 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§4701 - 4741, which was repealed and replaced by 44 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§2301 - 2336, which the library does not have. The Court notes that this section

---

probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.” See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(h); 1915A(c).

2. See, e.g., Bradley v. Puckett, 157 F.3d 1022, 1025 (5th Cir. 1998); Anyanwutaku v. Moore, 151 F.3d 1053 (D.C. Cir. 1998); Mitchell v. Farcass, 112 F.3d 1483, 1484 (11th Cir. 1997); McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 604 (6th Cir. 1997); Atkinson v. Bohn, 91 F.3d 1127, 1128 (8th Cir. 1996); Powell v. Hoover, 956 F. Supp. 564, 568 (M.D. Pa. 1997)(applying Rule 12(b)(6) standard to claim dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)); Tucker v. Angelone, 954 F. Supp. 134 (E.D. Va.), *aff'd*, 116 F.3d 473 (4th Cir. 1997).

merely was recodified at 44 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§2301 - 2336 and no textual changes were made to these sections.

In order to assert liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must meet two threshold requirements. He must allege: 1) that the alleged misconduct was committed by a person acting under color of state law; and 2) that as a result, he was deprived of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981), *overruled in part on other grounds*, Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 330-331 (1986).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have violated his right to access to the courts due to the alleged inadequate law library at the ACJ. This claim invokes the protections of the First Amendment, which provides as follows.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

U.S. Const. Amend. I.

The right of access to the courts is guaranteed by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. In Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), the United States Supreme Court held “that the fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law.” *Id.* at 828. However, in Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996), the Supreme Court effectively repudiated much of its prior holding in Bounds. In Lewis, the Supreme Court held that Bounds did not recognize an independent right in prisoners to have an adequate law library; instead, it concerned the established right of access to the courts. Lewis 518 U.S. at 351. Thus, the Lewis Court held that, in order to

successfully challenge a denial of this right of access to the courts, it is not enough for an inmate to establish that the law library provided was inadequate or he was denied access either to the law library or to legal materials; rather, he must establish that such inadequacies in the library or in accessing legal materials caused him actual harm.

In Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403 (2002), the Supreme Court set forth specific criteria that a court must consider in determining whether a plaintiff has alleged a viable claim of right to access to the courts. Specifically, the Supreme Court held that, in order to state a claim for denial of access to courts, a party must identify all of the following in the complaint: 1) a non-frivolous, underlying claim; 2) the official acts frustrating the litigation; and 3) a remedy that may be awarded as recompense but that is not otherwise available in a future suit. Christopher, 536 U.S. at 415.

The Court explained that the first requirement mandated that the Plaintiff specifically state in the complaint the underlying claim in accordance with the requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to the same degree as if the underlying claim was being pursued independently. Christopher, 536 U.S. at 417. In this regard, the statement must be sufficiently specific to ensure that the district court can ascertain that the claim is not frivolous and that the "the 'arguable' nature of the underlying claim is more than hope." *Id.* The second requirement requires a Plaintiff to clearly allege in the Complaint the official acts that frustrated the underlying litigation. Third, a Plaintiff must specifically identify a remedy that may be awarded as recompense in a denial-of-access case that would not be available in any other future litigation. *Id.* at 414.

Here, Plaintiff has failed to identify any legal action he was unable to pursue as a result of Defendants' alleged actions. Indeed, he actively is pursuing an omnibus pre-trial motion

and a mandamus action in his criminal case. Moreover, he was not prejudiced by the lack of new materials in the library because they merely are a recodification of the old law, which is available in the law library.

As set forth above, Plaintiff's Complaint does not show that any of the Defendants violated any of his constitutional rights. Thus, his Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully recommended that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed in accordance with the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with the Magistrate Judge's Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C), and Local Rule 72.1.4 B, the parties are allowed ten (10) days from the date of service to file written objections to this report. Any party opposing the objections shall have ten (10) days from the date of service of objections to respond thereto. Failure to timely file objections may constitute a waiver of any appellate rights.



Lisa Pupo Lenihan  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

January 31, 2007

cc: Gary L. Lancaster  
United States District Judge

Steven Lipovsky, Sr.  
MGP-3 #20  
Armstrong County Jail  
171 Staley's Courts Road  
Kittanning, PA 16201